

DeSota
Serial no. 10/725,853
Filed 12/1/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920020011US1

Page 7

REMARKS

Objection to the specification

The abstract has been objected to due to the inclusion of the phrase "is disclosed." Applicant has amended the specification to remove this offending phrase.

Objection to the claims

Claims 4 and 5 have been objected to as being difficult to read/parse, due to the lack of punctuation surrounding the phrase "one or more of." While these two claims have been cancelled, their subject matter has been at least partially incorporated into independent claim 1, and an attempt has been made to add the suggested punctuation into claim 1 to avoid reading/parsing difficulty.

Claims 1-9

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-9 ultimately depend. Claims 1-5 and 8-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Luick (6,088,769). Claim 6 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 6 depends from claim 5, which depends from claim 4, which depends from claim 1. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luick in view of Liberty (6,275,900).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to in essence incorporate the subject matter of claims 4, 5, and 6, and has cancelled claims 4, 5, and 6. (Additionally, claim 7, which had depended from claim 5, was amended to properly depend from claim 1.) There was a lot of duplication in the wording of claims 4, 5, and 6. Therefore, to make claim 1 easier to read, Applicant amended claim 1 in such a way as to cut down on as much duplication as possible, while still reciting the

DeSota
Serial no. 10/725,853
Filed 12/1/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920020011US1

Page 8

important subject matter of claims 4, 5, and 6. To that end, Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art. However, if the Examiner disagrees, and instead believes that some aspect of claims 4, 5, and 6 was not properly incorporated into claim 1, he is very much encourage to contact Applicant's representative, Michael Dryja, at the phone number listed below, to suggest what additional language needs to be added to claim 1 to render it patentable.

Furthermore, insofar as claim 1 is patentable, pending claims 2-3 and 7-9 are patentable due to their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 10-17

Claim 10 is an independent claim, from which claims 11-17 ultimately depend. Claims 10-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luick. Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luick in view of Glasco (6,950,913). Claim 15 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 directly depends from claim 10.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 15, and has cancelled claim 15. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 10 is allowable, such that claims 11-14 and 16-17 that depend from claim 10 are also allowable.

Claims 18-20

Claim 18 is an independent claim, from which claims 19 and 20 ultimately depend. Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Luick. Claim 19 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 19 directly depends from claim 18. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luick in view of Glasco.

DeSota
Serial no. 10/725,853
Filed 12/1/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920020011US1

Page 9

Applicant has amended claim 18 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 19, and has cancelled claim 19. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 18 is allowable, such that claim 20 that depends from claim 18 is also allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094, fax 206-374-2819